REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are presently pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen. Chen is directed to "Artifact-Free Displaying of MPEG-2 Video in the Progressive-Refresh Mode". Chen, Title.

Examiner indicated that Chen discloses "displaying the first one or more pictures in reverse order (Chen: Column 6, lines 15-21)…", Office Action at p. 3. Chen notes that "In other embodiments, the picture may not be decoded if it is neither an I-picture nor a P-picture, since it probably is a B-picture and B-pictures are typically not decoded or displayed in the absence of a completely decoded picture on both sides (before and after the B-pictures) of them." Chen, Column 6, Lines 15-21.

Claim 1 is amended to include, among other limitations, "displaying the first one or more pictures in reverse from play order", and assignee respectfully submits that Chen does not teach "displaying the first one or more pictures in reverse from play order". In contrast, Chen teaches that "B-pictures are typically not decoded or displayed in the absence of a completely decoded picture on both sides (before and after the B-pictures)." Assignee respectfully emphasizes the differences between "reverse from decode order" and "reverse from play order".

Examiner indicated that Chen discloses "displaying the second one or more pictures in reverse order (Chen: column 6, lines 45-55)…". Office Action, at 3. Chen, column 6, lines 45-55, teaches "when the MPEG-2 video stream includes a sequence of pictures $P_1B_1B_2P_2$ (in display order), the B-pictures B_1 and B_2 are displayed before the second P-picture P_2. However, in order to decode the B-pictures B_1 and B_2, the second P-picture P_2 must be decoded first. So the decode

4

order in this case would be $P_1P_2B_1B_2$, which is different from the display order."

Assignee has amended claim 1, to include, among other limitations, "displaying the second one or more pictures in reverse from play order" and respectfully submits that Chen does not teach "displaying the second one or more pictures in reverse from play order". Once again, Assignee respectfully emphasizes the differences between "reverse from decode order" and "reverse from play order".

Examiner indicated that Chen discloses "a display engine for displaying the first, second, and third one or more pictures from the group of pictures in reverse order (Chen: column 3, lines 43-50)…". Office Action, at 4. Chen, column 3, lines 43-50, teaches "The reconstructed picture is then stored in a reconstructed picture buffer 30, and may be displayed in accordance with a display order. The reconstructed picture may also used as a forward picture and/or backward picture for decoding of other pictures."

Assignee has amended claim 4 to include, among other limitations, "a display engine for displaying the first, second, and third one or more pictures from the group of pictures in reverse from play order" and respectfully submits that Chen does not teach the foregoing.

Accordingly, Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejections to claims 1 and 4 and dependent claims 2, 3, 5, and 6.

5

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are in a condition, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

August 23, 2006

Mirut Dalal, Esq.
ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE
Reg. No. 44,052

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone   (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100

6